Build with Google AI Forum

Read the community guidelines → Browse topics by tag →

Legal Effect of Moderator Awareness on User Reports

Bitu79 1h

The moderators on this forum are Google employees acting on behalf of the company. This is not an assumption but a verifiable fact: the official moderator list shows their names, roles and the “Google” affiliation next to them.

Because of this, when a moderator opens, views, flags or interacts with a post, it legally counts as the company becoming aware of the information. In law, it does not matter which channel the information arrives through. What matters is whether a representative of the organization has seen it. If they have, the organization is considered informed.

This means the following:

- Google cannot claim they “did not know” about the facts described in the post
- Google cannot claim they “did not receive” the information
- Google cannot claim they “never saw” the report

because the moderator’s activity is documented and time-stamped.

Skip to main content off (last reply, post 7)

The forum is not an official complaint channel, so Google has no obligation to respond here. However, the lack of obligation to reply does not change the fact that knowledge has been

obtained. From the moment a moderator sees the content, the company is legally considered aware of it.

The moderator view, the moderator list, the timestamps and the archived snapshots together form a complete and verifiable evidence chain showing that Google has been informed of the issue.



All my posts can be found here:

@Bitu79

Gabor Gabor

Joined May 3, 2026

I created this post because the issues I reported are not simple feedback or random comments. They involve concrete problems related to user data, privacy, system behavior and potential data-handling failures. When a company becomes aware of a possible data-related issue, they are not free to ignore it. Under GDPR and general legal standards, they are required to assess, investigate and, if necessary, respond. This obligation begins the moment the company becomes aware of the issue.

Skip to main content off (last reply, post 7) us volunteers. They are Google employees acting on behalf of the company, which is clearly shown on the official moderator list. When a moderator opens a post, reads it, flags it or interacts with it in any way, it legally means that

Google has become aware of the content. Organizational knowledge works like this: if a representative sees it, the organization sees it. Because of this, the moment a moderator viewed my posts, Google became aware of the issues I reported.

I created this post to document this fact in a clear, traceable and verifiable way. The moderator view, the timestamps, the archived snapshots and the official moderator list together form a complete chain of evidence. This makes it impossible for the company to later claim that they “did not know,” “did not receive,” or “never saw” the information. They did. Their own moderator saw it.

This post is not about demanding a reply on the forum. It is about establishing that the company has already reached the point where a response is legally required. Once they are aware of a potential data-handling issue, they have obligations under GDPR and their own internal compliance rules. Whether they choose to respond here or through another channel is their decision, but the responsibility to act already exists.

Bitu79 1h

> **Legal Effect of Moderator Awareness on User Reports**
>
> The moderators on this forum are Google employees acting on behalf of the company. This is not an assumption but a verifiable fact: the official moderator list shows their names, roles and the “Google” affiliation next to them. Because of this,...

Skip to main content off (last reply, post 7) 1h

I am no longer writing about the original error itself — I am writing about the legal consequences of covering up that error. The company knew about it and did nothing. This is exactly what qualifies as a “cover-up.” My post makes it clear that the company has a legal obligation to respond, because this is a data-handling issue

All my posts can be viewed here:

> **@Bitu79**
>
> Gabor Gabor
>
> Joined May 3, 2026

Bitu79 **1h**

> **Legal Effect of Moderator Awareness on User Reports**
>
> I am no longer writing about the original error itself — I am writing about the legal consequences of covering up that error. The company knew about it and did nothing. This is exactly what qualifies as a “cover-up.” My post makes it clear that...

> **Fire Shot Capture 168 Legal Effect Of Moderator Awareness On User Reports...**
>
> [illegible]ator Awareness on User Reports - [illegible]

Skip to main content off (last reply, post 7)



Bitu79 **18m**

> **Statement on the Contradiction Between Google's Deletion Promises and the Actu...**
>
> On May 9, 2026, Google LLC's Legal Department (Attn: Custodian of Records, Mountain View, CA) officially received and signed for my comprehensive Pre-Litigation Demand Letter regarding Case ID: 7-1774000040461. The letter exhaustively documents systemic GDPR violations within Google's architecture, specifically: The "Delete" button fraud (the deceptive 32-day TTL backend retention of supposedly deleted data). The automated AI identity-reconstruction and profiling engine. Crucially, Sec...

> **The Ultimate Proof: Google's Forum AI Just Doxxed Me While Summarizing My Post ...**
>
> You're completely missing the point. I'm not asking for censorship, and I'm not trying to make AI "boring". The issue I'm reporting is simple: Google's AI Overview publicly linked my real name, old aliases, unrelated platforms and even external security databases into one identity profile — without consent. That's not "censorship". That's illegal automated profiling under EU law. And before you say anything else: here, take a look at the latest

Skip to main content off (last reply, post 7)



This is no longer about the original error, but about the legal consequences of Google having verifiably received, acknowledged, internally registered — and later even removed from its own support dashboard — the case, yet still choosing to take no action, which elevates the situation from a simple technical failure to a documented act of willful neglect with clear GDPR implications.

Skip to main content off (last reply, post 7)





Skip to main content off (last reply, post 7)

Skip to main content off (last reply, post 7)

Skip to main content off (last reply, post 7)

Suggested / Related	Replies	Views	Activity
Did Google AI Studio silently change safety filtering today? Full responses now get erased instead of stopping generation – this breaks creative writing and RP 14 bug, ai-studio, gemini, feedback, safety	241	6.6k	3h
Face_landmarker is open source • models	0	16	1d
Antigravity 2.0 Install on Linux • models	4	46	28m
Gemini API shows Tier 1 rate limits despite AI Studio displaying Paid Tier 2, and our production service is suspended due to spend cap restrictions • bug, api, ai-studio, gemini	0	4	38m
Nconsistent PROHIBITED_CONTENT errors (False Positives) in Kids' Virtual Try-On Project using gemini-3.1-flash-image-preview • gemini-flash	0	3	1h

There are 2 unread and 119 new topics remaining, or browse other topics in